



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

buryport, one of the original thirteen of Garrison's disciples, who repeatedly risked his life in helping back to freedom colored men who had been kidnapped at the North and taken to the extreme South. Whittier has drawn his portrait in his poem, "To My Old Schoolmaster."

One of the features of the underground service commented upon by our author was its effect as a safety-valve to the institution of slavery. If some of the abler men like Douglass had found no other means of escape, they might have organized formidable insurrections. Many slaves were the sons of masters, and it would be strange if they did not inherit some instincts that might prove dangerous to the institution which degraded them. Some masters were found who had not the heart to enslave their own children, and who sent them to the best schools in Canada. It is not generally known, but it is true, that two of the ablest and best beloved priests in the Roman Catholic Church in this country are sons of a master who thus provided for them and who gave freedom to their mother. One of these sons, who might have been a slave, is now a bishop. He is a cousin of the escaped slave, Ellen Craft, their mothers being sisters, and like her he has only slight trace of his negro origin. The writer of this review had the story from Ellen Craft herself, who called upon her cousin when she last visited this country.

Professor Hart, of Harvard University, contributes an introduction to this valuable work, in which he calls attention to the points upon which Professor Siebert's immense labor throws new light.

SAMUEL T. PICKARD.

The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal. By Mrs. ARCHIBALD DIXON. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company. 1899. Pp. xii, 623.)

MRS. DIXON is not pleased with the historians who have written of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal. In her judgment none of them have treated these important measures adequately and most of them have added misrepresentation to their other shortcomings. She has undertaken, therefore, in the interest of truth and justice, to set forth "a clear statement" of the facts. While Mr. Dixon, naturally, figures rather prominently in the book, the great burden of it proves to be the cupidity and aggression of the North. We are told that these unfortunate traits became prominent as early as the date of the Federal Convention; that three of the New England states, striking a bargain with South Carolina and Georgia, fastened the slave-trade upon the country for twenty years and that our subsequent national calamities were largely the fruit of this base triumph of greed over principle.

The debates of the convention on the slave-trade may not be altogether pleasant reading, but Mrs. Dixon does the Northern representatives scant justice. Some of them believed with Oliver Ellsworth that "slavery in time will not be a speck in our country," and this conviction served to gloss and disguise "the compromising;" others felt that

Congress, in ultimately securing control of the traffic, which it did not possess under the old confederation, gained a great point. Besides, Roger Sherman voiced the general sentiment when he said that it was "better to let the Southern states import slaves than to part company with them." As the choice seemed to be between twenty years of slave-trade and anarchy they chose the former. Madison approved of this choice at least after it was made. "Great as the evil is," he said in the convention of Virginia on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, "a dismemberment of the Union would be worse."

Mrs. Dixon contends that the defeat of Charles Pinckney's motion to postpone the report of the committee on the slave-trade and take up the navigation act fastened this traffic upon the unwilling South, because the North would never have agreed to the report if a two-thirds vote should be necessary to pass a navigation act. Suppose "the compliance" with certain Southern states had failed, what then? "Do we remedy the evil?" asked Iredell in the convention of North Carolina. "No, sir, we do not. For if the Constitution be not adopted, it will be in the power of every state to continue it forever." He considered the concession agreed upon, such was the attitude of South Carolina and Georgia, "the utmost that could be obtained."

It does not seem to have occurred to Mrs. Dixon that the opposition of Virginia to the continuance of the slave-trade might have been inspired quite as much by commercial as by ethical considerations. She owned more than half of the 520,000 slaves estimated to have been in the South when the Constitution was adopted. Fresh importations tended to lessen their value. At all events it is suggestive that George Mason should denounce the slave-trade, in the Virginia convention, as so inhuman that he could not express his detestation of it, and yet should complain, as if the victim of some great injustice, "they have not secured us the property of the slaves we have already!" According to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney "the opinion" of Virginia in the Federal convention was "interested and inconsistent." The North, according to Mrs. Dixon, appeared to no better advantage in the Federal Congress of 1819-1821 than in the Federal Convention of 1787. She describes the Missouri Compromise as "an unjust, arbitrary and unconstitutional exercise of power on the part of Congress." It was a surrender rather than a compromise. That the territories belonged to the whole country; that citizens of every section had a right to migrate thither and take with them their property whether the inventory happened to include slaves or not, seems as indisputable to our author as the axioms of mathematics. Fear of losing control of the House of Representatives, she says, and the fact that if Southern institutions got a footing in Missouri Northern laborers would be excluded, led to a plot to prevent the admission of this territory except as a free state. The South felt exclusion to be "an infinite wrong" and accepted a geographical compromise as the only alternative to disunion.

Is all this "A True History?" Mrs. Dixon does not like Benton

and may not regard his declaration, that the compromise, so far from being a Northern measure, was "imposed . . . by the South upon the North," as a matter of particular importance, but she ought to be interested in a letter of Charles Pinckney, dated "Congress Hall, March 2, 1820, 3 o'clock at night," and addressed to the editor of a Charleston newspaper. The bill, he wrote, "is considered here by the slave-holding states as a great triumph," since the territory free of the restriction will give the South six and perhaps eight senators. Then, if the first compromise was imposed upon the South, how did it happen that the North should have repudiated the compact in less than a year after it received the signature of President Monroe? The fact is that the objections raised against the constitution of Missouri were merely a convenient mask for a fresh attack upon the geographical settlement.

The South did not think that the Missouri question would produce a dissolution of the Union, at least Calhoun, whose views were likely to be as gloomy as those of any man in Washington, did not. One does not find in the Congressional debates much evidence of serious apprehension on the part of the Southern Congressmen. Northern Representatives, it is true, indulged in some inflammatory talk. Tallmadge would not forbear to contribute his "mite of blood" if it should be necessary to quench any conflagration he had helped to kindle, and Otis of Massachusetts, rather than admit Missouri with slavery, could wish the Mississippi had been "an eternal torrent of burning lava, impassable as the lake which separates the evil and the good." This sort of declaration did not disturb the Southern Representatives very much. They were able to take care of themselves both in the matter of rhetoric and of argument. John Quincy Adams pronounced them superior to the Northern Representatives. Indeed they succeeded in driving the latter from their original position that Congress has the right to impose conditions upon new commonwealths, which the Constitution did not impose upon the original commonwealths, but failed to dislodge them from their second position that the Constitution confers upon Congress general powers of legislation in the territories. This doctrine constituted the basis of the compromise and is sound from the standpoint of constitutional law.

Mrs. Dixon devotes a large amount of space to the repeal of the Missouri restriction—a measure which her husband proposed as an amendment to Douglas's bill to organize the territory of Nebraska. She effectually disposes of the story, which has gained some currency, that Seward "put Archy Dixon . . . up to moving the repeal." The Kentucky senator needed no suggestion of that sort. While the Douglas bill adopted the non-intervention principles of the Compromise of 1850, he saw that it did not repeal the Missouri Compromise. Believing in direct methods and consulting nobody he gave notice in the Senate, January 16, 1854, of his intention to force a repeal of this so-called compact. Dixon's motives were wholly sincere and patriotic. He contended that the restrictive legislation was unconstitutional and that popular sover-

eignty or home-rule was a principle of universal application, the adoption of which in the territories would compose all sectional strife. Douglas finally "engrafted" the amendment upon his Nebraska bill. Doubtless he preferred the original indefiniteness of the measure, since it appears to have been chiefly a move in the game of presidential politics.

But the Nebraska bill with or without amendment was a monumental blunder and nothing that Mrs. Dixon has written makes it seem otherwise—unless war and the destruction of slavery by force of arms were to be desired. Apparently it never occurred to Senator Dixon or to the author of *The True History*, that if Congress had the right to acquire territory, it must also have the right to govern it. The South should have left no stone unturned to perpetuate the era of good feeling which followed upon the Compromise of 1850. It should have avoided all irritating and sectional issues, strengthened its system of domestic policy, and pocketed philosophically the occasional loss of a runaway slave. But other counsels prevailed; the Missouri Compromise was repealed—a result which the Compromise of 1850 did not effect—and the firebrand of popular sovereignty flung into the territories. The consequences of a measure, which was vague in all essential matters, which neither indicated the time when the will of the people should be ascertained nor provided machinery to determine it, could be nothing less than confusion, lawlessness and finally bloodshed.

Mrs. Dixon carries the practice of allowing men to tell their own story to excess. Chapter XX., for example, which contains seventy-three pages, is mainly a report of debates from the *Congressional Globe*. And on the whole her book, though dedicated to the truth of history, may be fairly characterized as an impassioned defense of mistaken policies and untenable constitutional theories.

LEVERETT W. SPRING.

History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party, together with Appendices containing the Treaties, relating to such Arbitrations, and Historical and Legal Notes on other International Arbitrations ancient and modern, and on the Domestic Commissions of the United States for the Adjustment of International Claims. By JOHN BASSETT MOORE, Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University, New York; sometime Assistant Secretary of State of the United States. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1898. Six vols., pp. 5079.)

FIVE years ago Professor Moore began his labors, now happily and honorably ended, upon the history of the international arbitrations to which our government has been a party. This work has been done under a virtual Congressional contract, designating him as the editor, the consideration of which was the beggarly sum of twenty-five hundred dollars,